



**FP7 RESEARCH PROJECT
FOR NEW EUROPEAN CRIMES
AND TRUST-BASED POLICY**



FIDUCIA

NEW EUROPEAN CRIMES AND TRUST-BASED POLICY



**SP1 - COOPERATION
SSH.2011.3.2-1
GRANT AGREEMENT NR 290653**

Work Package 12:	Trust and attitudes to justice “abroad”
Task 12.1:	Design of the survey indicators
Deliverable 12.1:	Extending procedural justice theory: Report on the design of new survey indicators

Version:	1	Date:	14/10/2014
Type:	Deliverable		
Confidentiality:	Public		
Responsible Partner:	LSE		
Editors:	Jonathan Jackson (LSE) and Ben Bradford (Oxford)		
Contributors:	Jonathan Jackson, Ben Bradford, Mike Hough and Stephany Carrillo		

CONTENT LIST:

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	3
1. INTRODUCTION.....	5
2. MOTIVATING A NEW MULTI-NATIONAL STUDY OF CRIME AND LEGITIMACY.....	8
2.1 Compliance with 'new' laws and regulations.....	8
2.2 Cybercrime.....	10
2.3 Procedural justice, legitimacy and compliance across national boundaries.	11
2.4 Policing of migrants and minorities.....	12
3. MOTIVATING THE SURVEY INDICATORS.....	15
3.1 Orientations towards the law.....	16
3.2 Cybercrime.....	16
3.3 Procedural justice, legitimacy and compliance across national boundaries.	17
3.4 Policing of migrants and minorities - Contact with Police.....	18
3.5 Item-count Technique.....	18
4. KEY HYPOTHESIS.....	21
4.1 Compliance with 'new' laws and regulations.....	21
4.2 Cybercrime.....	22
4.3 Procedural justice, legitimacy and compliance across national boundaries.	22
4.4 Policing of migrants and minorities.....	23
4.5 Item-count Technique.....	23
5. SUMMARY AND NEXT STEPS.....	24
APPENDIX A: 12.1 SURVEY.....	25
REFERENCES.....	60

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Work Package 12 builds on Work Package 11's analysis of data from European Social Survey (ESS) Round 5. In Work Package 11 we assessed the importance of trust and legitimacy across Europe in the context of 'everyday crimes' such as buying stolen goods. The objective was to assess the portability of procedural justice theory. Providing a normative lens through which to understand how people might best be policed. Procedural justice theory posits a string of connected empirical links between (a) the treatment people receive at the hand of criminal justice officials; (b) the legitimacy people confer, as a consequence, on institutions of justice including the police and the criminal courts; (c) the authority that these institutions can then command; and (d) public preparedness to obey the police, comply with the law and cooperate with the justice system.

In Work Package 12 we move beyond the ESS to explore in more detail different types of crimes and to examine whether legitimacy moves across national borders. An important limitation of the ESS data is its twin focus on everyday crimes (like buying stolen goods) and the legitimacy of national justice institutions. Through a new seven-country survey (see Appendix A), Work Package 12 will extend procedural justice theory to include (a) other crimes and (b) people's perceptions of the legitimacy of justice institutions in European jurisdictions other than their own.

Work Package 12 has three specific objectives:

1. To chart public perceptions of new forms of criminal behaviour of the sort examined by three of the four case-study work-packages (WPs 7-9, trafficking of goods, over-policing of migrants, and cybercrime) in the United Kingdom, Germany, Italy, Finland, Bulgaria, Lithuania and Turkey. The survey thus concentrates on the issues best covered via such a methodology – trafficking of goods, cybercrime, and policing of migrants – the focus of work-package 6, human trafficking, is not amenable to this type of investigation as it is so far removed from the experience and knowledge of most ordinary members of the public.

2. To assess whether the same sort of relationship between trust in justice, perceived legitimacy and compliance exist for new crimes – such as illegal downloading – as are observed in everyday crimes.
3. To assess whether perceptions of the legitimacy of domestic justice institutions flow across national borders into those of other countries. The key question here is whether – in an era where new crimes are emerging across Member States and where policy responses are becoming increasingly trans-national – how important public trust and institutional legitimacy are in relation to “foreign” institutions of justice.

Deliverable 12.1 is organised into five sections:

1. The introduction sets out the conceptual and theoretical underpinnings of the public perception survey;
2. Motivating the multi-national study of crime and legitimacy;
3. Motivating the survey indicators;
4. Key hypotheses;
5. Summary and next steps.

1. INTRODUCTION

How do legal authorities prevent crime and elicit cooperation in the communities they serve? This question looms large in any discussion concerning the nature, structure and activities of police organizations and systems of criminal justice. To control crime, we need to understand why people obey the law and cooperate with legal authorities. If crime policies are to persuade and dissuade, they need to resonate with people's sense of morality and rationality.

Two models of how and why the activity of police and other criminal justice agents affects crime-related behaviour of citizens dominate policy and practice (Tyler, 2011a; Schulhofer *et al.*, 2011). The first is based on instrumental motives, deterrence and rational choice (Nagin, 2013). By projecting force and effectiveness, the justice system will fight crime, buy public cooperation, and secure compliance through efficacy and a credible threat of sanction (Tyler, 2003).

Questions raised under this approach include where and when might deterrence policies be effective; how can those who are already predisposed to commit crime be prevented from actually doing so; and why people cooperate with legal authorities. Focusing primarily on instrumental motivations and material incentives, studies into the relevance of rational choice have addressed the particular circumstances in which deterrence may or may not be relevant (e.g. Piquero *et al.*, 2011), the extent to which policies or practices such as problem-oriented or 'hot-spot' policing might affect levels of crime in specific locales (Weisburd *et al.*, 2010; Braga *et al.*, 2012), and the importance of fear of crime and police effectiveness in driving public cooperation (Sunshine & Tyler, 2003; Jackson *et al.*, 2012b; European Social Survey, 2012).

The second model is based on normative factors, i.e. motivations to behave according to moral principles. Developed in the US (Tyler, 2006a, 2006b, 2011b; Sunshine & Tyler, 2003; Tyler and Huo, 2002) but applied in an increasing number of contexts across the world (Gau and Brunson, 2010; Tankebe, 2009, 2012; Hough *et al.*, 2013; Reisig and Lloyd, 2009; Jackson *et al.*, 2012a, 2012b; Taylor *et al.*, 2012; Elliott *et al.*, 2011; Bradford *et*

al., 2013; Kochel, 2012; Kochel *et al.*, 2011; Hinds and Murphy, 2007; Murphy and Cherney, 2012; Mazerolle *et al.*, 2013; Murphy *et al.*, 2009; Huq *et al.*, 2011a, 2011b), procedural justice theory stresses positive social connections between criminal justice agencies and the populations they serve. The experience of procedurally fair treatment and decision-making fosters people's beliefs that the police have a positive right to exercise power and influence. If legitimacy shapes people's propensities to comply with the law and cooperate with the police through internalisation of values, then legitimacy emerges not just as a normative belief about the authority of the police and legal system, but also as a commitment to the 'normative and inferential consequences of holding that belief' (Hinsch, 2010: 42).

Findings from Work Package 11 (see also Hough *et al.*, 2013a, 2013b & 2013c) support the importance of legitimacy in countries across Europe. Extant studies have tended to focus on the sort of 'everyday crimes' that straddle the line between more serious crimes and those that according to Karstedt and Farrall (2006: 1011) 'fall into a grey zone of legality and morality.' These behaviours include buying stolen goods, committing traffic offences, and cheating on taxes or benefit claims.

Does this framework pertain to other forms of criminal behaviour though? A recent study linked perceived police legitimacy to certain types of self-reported violent behaviour, i.e. carrying a gun and getting into a fight (Papachristos *et al.*, 2012). Further expanding the focus, Work Package 12 addresses whether the framework is applicable to downloading music, TV shows or films from internet sites that may be illegal, buying alcohol, cigarettes or other goods that have been brought into the country without taxes being paid, and employing somebody who does not have the right to work in the country (e.g. as a plumber or nanny).

Work Package 12 also assesses how people think about the legitimacy of criminal justice systems of other countries. The intention here is to investigate the extent to which norms-based justice policies might apply across as well as within national boundaries. With increasing international social mobility, more and more people are finding themselves

asked to cooperate, and comply, with criminal justice systems and actors outside the country in which they normally reside. Are procedural justice, trust and legitimacy important here too, or do people on holiday, or working in a country for a short period place more emphasis on instrumental factors?

2. MOTIVATING A NEW MULTI-NATIONAL STUDY OF CRIME AND LEGITIMACY

A survey will be fielded in seven European countries, chosen in light of their value as representatives of significant criminal trends, policy trends, as well as local peculiarities. The countries included are Bulgaria, Finland, Germany, Italy, Lithuania, Turkey and the United Kingdom, and the surveys will be provided in their respective languages. At the core of the survey are measures of public trust in legal authorities, the perceived legitimacy of the institutions, and a range of potential outcomes of trust and legitimacy (most importantly, cooperation with authorities and compliance behaviour). The survey pilots the new indicators developed in Task 12.1. As indicated above, survey respondents will be asked not just about the police and criminal courts in their own country, but also institutions of criminal justice in other countries. The structuring of the surveys is based off of the ESS Methodology that holds high quality standards in the field of cross-national surveys.

As the most visible representation of the criminal justice system, and the aspect of it most frequently encountered by citizens, the survey will concentrate on experiences and perceptions of police. Over and above mapping out perceptions and judgements about the police in the seven countries, however, the surveys will cover four additional key areas of concern. The international nature of the survey is central to addressing each, as variation across all four areas would be expected at the nation-state level, and results from any one country might offer a highly misleading view of European-wide trends.

2.1 Compliance with 'new' laws and regulations

The idea that principles of normative social regulation are effective in motivating compliance with the law is well established, although, it has to be said, not definitively proven (Tyler 2006; Jackson et al. 2012; Bradford et al. in press etc.). Central here is the idea that the legitimacy of the legal system, and particularly the police, motivates compliance (a) because legitimation involves ceding to authorities the right to determine appropriate behaviour, including what is and what is not 'the right thing to do' and (b) because legitimation involves identification with an institution and internalization of its

values, which, in the case of legal institutions, may revolve around abiding by the law. The ‘power’ of legitimacy as a way to generate compliance is that granting legitimacy to legal authorities encourages a sense that it is, in and of itself, right to obey the law – to abide by the dictates of legitimate authority – and this obviates the need to make decisions about the content of specific laws (which one may or may not agree with). The legitimacy of legal authorities may therefore be an important factor promoting compliance with new laws and regulations, such as those surrounding file sharing or the grey market, which pertain to behaviours that many people do not have firm or fixed opinions on. That is, most people do not commit burglary because they believe it is morally wrong to do so; they may not believe it is morally wrong to buy cigarettes on which tax has not been paid, however, meaning that compliance with tax or duty-related regulations must be obtained via either (costly) deterrence measures *or* promotion of the idea that obeying the law is in itself the right thing to do, regardless of what one thinks about specific illegal acts.

This idea opens up a series of questions. Some are purely empirical. Is the legitimacy of the police associated with people’s stated propensities to abide by ‘new’ laws? Might the promotion of legitimacy, via procedural justice, motivate people to abide by rules when they are neutral or ambivalent about the moral content of those rules? Some questions however are also conceptual – perhaps most importantly, do the mechanisms described above actually rely on *some* level of understanding or perception that behaviours proscribed by law are harmful? The content of the criminal law is, in most countries, concerned primarily with activities most citizens find morally reprehensible, usually because the acts proscribed by law hurt others; even regulatory offences, such as speeding, are often premised on the idea that the action involved is potentially harmful. The extent to which legitimacy motivates compliance may, therefore, rest in large part on the ability of justice actors, through their behaviour, to *activate* moral values people already hold but which, for whatever reason, they might be minded or forced to ignore. Many new laws, by contrast, seem to relate to behaviours so few find morally reprehensible that it may be that legitimacy simply does not ‘work’ in securing compliance. File sharing is a case in point: one might conjecture that since so few people find it morally wrong to download and/or share

music files there is no moral position to be activated by the behaviour of justice agents, and only deterrence will work.

Alternatively, of course, it may be that the core ideas of procedural justice theory hold, and people who hold police legitimate are more likely to abide by 'new' laws, too, because they have internalised the idea that it is right to obey the law whatever its content. Another idea here is that legitimization of legal authorities encourages or enhances the sense that the laws they enforce relate to actions that are morally wrong (since legitimate authorities are empowered to determine right and wrong behaviour). This is in a sense a legal socialization argument – people learn that certain behaviours are wrong via integration of those behaviours into legal frameworks enforced by legitimate authority. On this account, too, norms-based regulation should help promote compliance with laws covering actions of ambiguous or contested moral status.

2.2 Cybercrime

The FIDUCIA survey touches upon cybercrime, specifically on the notion of how wrong it is to illegally download internet material, and the level of concern over being or becoming a victim of cybercrime. The purpose is to compare the results between cybercrime as a “new crime” and other everyday crimes, and determine whether they have the same or similar relationship of trust in justice, perceived legitimacy and compliance.

Cybercrime encompasses a number of criminal activities that have become more numerous in recent years due to technological advancements and the increased use of Internet services such as online banking and social networking. The survey intends to determine what aspects of online criminal activity have had more of an impact in these selected countries. The purpose is to correlate the criminal activity with the trust, or lack thereof, of online security measures being taken.

2.3 Procedural justice, legitimacy and compliance across national boundaries

A key aspect of procedural justice theory is the notion of shared group membership. Procedurally fair behaviour on the part of justice agents strengthens the social bonds between citizens and justice institutions, and between citizens and the social group the institutions represent, which in turn encourages trust, legitimation of group authorities, the sense that they are worthy of cooperation and support, and acceptance of their right to determine behaviour. Conversely, procedural injustice weakens peoples social bonds, serving to marginalise and exclude those who experience it, while damaging trust, legitimacy, cooperation and compliance (Blader and Tyler 2003; Bradford 2014; Bradford et al. 2014).

These ideas presuppose, however, that citizens believe that they can at least potentially share group identities with justice agents; absent this connection, why should they care about the identity relevant aspects (for example fairness) of the behaviours of group authorities? In the context of a single nation state this idea is in fact relatively unproblematic – most citizens feel at least a nominal sense of connection to the country in which they live (indeed, most will have been born there), and justice agents such as police clearly represent this social entity in some way. ‘Procedural justice effects’, linking personal experience with trust, legitimacy and cooperation have been found within many different countries (REFS), attesting that notions of shared group membership in the relationship between, for example, police and public are found in diverse national contexts.

The extent to which procedural justice translates *across* boundaries is however open to question. With increasing population mobility across Europe, people are encountering ‘foreign’ legal systems and criminal justice actors more and more frequently. Do citizens living temporarily or holidaying in another country place the same emphasis on the procedural fairness of its justice agents as long-term residents? Does the perceived legitimacy of the French police, for example, predict compliance with French laws among people normally residing outside France? Or do instrumental factors become more important in such situations?

These questions are important because they suggest that trust-based justice policies may be differentially effective among EU citizens acting in different contexts. People ‘passing through’ a country may be less attuned to the fairness of its police and other justice actors. These are also difficult questions to address in a survey context since, for most respondents, such concerns are likely to be largely hypothetical. That is, despite increased cross-border movement, relatively few people have significant direct experience of the criminal justice systems of other countries. Although, importantly, their perceptions of such systems may become relevant in particular situations, for example if they are victimised or witness a crime while on holiday. Just as for citizens of a particular country, the *potential* for non-citizens to cooperate with police is an important policy issue.

Work Package 12 also attempts to address these issues. Using a short vignette, the survey will probe the extent to which people’s relationships with police in countries other than their own are shaped by procedural justice concerns and, therefore, the extent to which norms-based justice policies – such as encouraging police to treat all those they encounter with dignity and respect – might find purchase *across* as well as *within* national boundaries. An important issue here will be the extent to which people’s connections to a country moderate any association between procedural justice and legitimacy – it may be, for example, that people who feel a stronger connection to a country place more emphasis on the procedural fairness of its police because they are more attuned to the identity-relevant information contained in police behaviour.

2.4 Policing of migrants and minorities

The final aspect of the surveys outlined here relates to the policing of migrants and/or minorities and, more broadly, the experience of police among all respondents across the seven countries. Expanding on the suite of questions fielded in the ESS, the FIDUCIA survey will include a set of questions concerning respondent’s experiences of contact with the police. These will cover both police-initiated contact (e.g. a street stop) as well as contact initiated by the respondent themselves, and will include items on incidence, frequency

and assessment of the quality of the interaction (e.g. satisfaction with the way the police behaved).

The idea that the behaviour of justice agents is an important factor shaping trust, legitimacy, cooperation and compliance is central to procedural justice theory. Encounters with police officers are “teachable moments” (Tyler 2011) within which people obtain information concerning, for example, the trustworthiness of police, which then feeds into their legitimacy judgements and subsequent behaviours (Bradford et al. 2009; Tyler and Fagan 2008; Sunshine and Tyler 2003). Yet, there is much evidence to suggest that the quality of such encounters is not evenly distributed across different populations and, in particular, migrant and minority groups are often of the receiving end of excessive, and disproportionality negative, police attention and behaviour in many different national contexts (e.g. Anon et al 2013; Bowling and Philips 2002; Fassin 2013; Way and Patten 2013; Weber and Bowling 2012). This obviously has implications not only for the individuals concerned, who may, for example, find themselves caught up in the criminal justice system, but for entire groups of people, who over time become embedded in problematic relationships with police. Moreover, with increased inter- and indeed intra-national mobility more and more people across Europe are becoming ‘migrants’ and ‘minorities’ and, because of this, may be experiencing more negative forms of policing than their majority group counterparts; indeed, migration itself is increasingly becoming the object of police attention, and criminologists and others have started to use the term ‘crimmigration’ to characterise the developing convergence between immigration and criminal law and the resulting emphasis on providing police solutions to issues of immigration (e.g. Franko Aas and Bosworth 2013; Stumpf 2006).

The FIDUCIA survey will attempt to tap into these issues by including, alongside standard socio-demographic indicators, items on ethnicity and country of birth (as a measure of immigrant status). Direct measures of ethnicity are relatively unusual in many surveys outside the UK (surveyors often rely on proxies such as parent’s country of birth), and an important contribution of the survey may be investigation of variation in experiences of police between majority and minority groups, and between migrants and

native-born. However a word of caution is required – since the sample size of the surveys is unlikely to exceed 1,000 in any one country, and since overall numbers of minority and immigrant groups in European countries remains low, it is likely the surveys will pick up only relatively small numbers of ethnic minority and migrant respondents, which will limit the ability of analysis to pick up across-group variation. That said, a recent telephone survey in Spain, with a sample of 2,000, was able to identify significantly higher ‘police stop’ rates among minority and migrant groups (Anon et al. 2013); moreover, the FIDUCIA surveys may be able to pick up across-group variation in perceptions of police, even if the numbers of respondents with contact experiences is very low.

3. MOTIVATING THE SURVEY INDICATORS

Many of the questions in the seven-country FIDUCIA survey were first fielded in the ‘Trust in justice’ module of the 5th round of the European Social Survey (European Social Survey 2011). As such they are survey items already proven in a high-quality, cross-national survey, and will require little further attention at the design stage. Box 1 shows the key concepts measured in the ESS, and which have been adopted for the FIDUCIA survey

Box 1 Some of the key concepts measured in the Trust in Justice module of ESS Round 5.

Bolded text indicates concepts also measure in the FIDUCIA survey

- a. Trust in justice institutions
 - i. **Trust in police effectiveness**
 - ii. **Trust in police procedural fairness**
 - iii. **Trust in police distributive fairness**
 - iv. Trust in court effectiveness
 - v. Trust in court procedural fairness
 - vi. Trust in court distributive fairness
- b. Perceived legitimacy
 - i. **Consent to police authority (a sense of obligation to obey the police)**
 - ii. Consent to court authority (a sense of obligation to defer to the authority of the courts)
 - iii. **Moral alignment with the police (endorsement of the moral right to power)**
 - iv. Moral alignment with the courts (endorsement of the moral right to power)
 - v. The perceived legality of the police (operating under the rule of law)
 - vi. The perceived legality of court officials (operating under the rule of law)
- c. Willingness to cooperate with the police and courts
 - i. **Preparedness to report crimes to the police**
 - ii. **Preparedness to identify suspect to the police**
 - iii. Preparedness to act as a juror in court
- d. **Compliance with the law: self-report measures of law-breaking over the past 5 years**
- e. **Morality of the law (perceptions of how wrong it is to break specific laws)**
- f. **Perceptions of risk**

The FIDUCIA survey also requires new measures, which are outlined below. Recall that two versions of the survey exist. First, a core set of items will be fielded in all seven countries. Second, an additional set of items, which expand on many of the key concepts, will be provided to the survey managers in each country, to be fielded if resources allow.

3.1 Orientations toward the law

Expanding the list of illegal activities covered in the ESS, the FIDUCIA survey will cover attitudes and activities in relation to five illegal acts:

- Downloading music, TV shows and other files from illegal internet sites
- Stealing a DVD or other media format containing music, TV shows or films from a shop
- Buying something thought to be stolen
- Buying alcohol, cigarettes or other goods that have been bought into the country without the tax being paid
- Employing somebody who does not have the right to work in the country, for example as a plumber or a nanny.

The ESS module contained items probing respondents law-breaking over the past 5 years (Q98-Q102), their assessment of the (im)morality of the illegal acts (Q1-Q5), and their judgement of the likelihood of being caught if they break these same laws (Q16-Q20). The FIDUCIA survey will replicate these questions, and also add:

- A set of questions concerning respondent's self-assessed propensity to break the law in the future (Q103-Q105). This approach has been shown to be a useful complement to asking about behaviours that may have occurred in the past (Lyn Exum and Bouffard 2012).
- A set of items probing respondents views of the harmfulness of the behaviours concerned (Q6-Q10, expanded version of the survey only)
- A further set of items probing respondent's assessments of social disapproval surrounding the same behaviours (Q11-Q15, expanded version of the survey only)

Finally, the survey will include an 'item-count' experiment. See section 3.5

3.2 Cybercrime

The FIDUCIA survey has an entire section dedicated to cybercrime, in relation to security concerns, online harassment, victimization, and their moral views on illegal online activity (Q125a-Q125i).

First, the respondents are questioned on their frequency of a list of online activities, including online banking, social networking, and downloading music (Q125a). Second, the questions aim to determine their level of confidence in the security features of namely online banking, buying goods or services, and use of online administrative services that require payments offered by local or national government authorities (Q125b). They are asked to reflect on how security issues have caused them to change their Internet habits (Q125c), and to respond to whether they have ever been victims of online harassment (Q125d).

The concept of being a victim of online criminal activity is the third and final portion of the cybercrime section of the survey. The questions here intend to determine what kind of online criminal activity they have become a victim of (Q125e), what kind of internet activity they are concern about (Q125f), if they have ever had their online accounts hacked or compromised (Q125h), and how much money they have lost due to online fraud and other online criminal activity in the past three years (Q125i).

3.3 Procedural justice, legitimacy and compliance across national boundaries

A series of questions will be needed to investigate the international portability of norms-based regulation. First, respondents will be asked to identify which, if any, European country they have visited most in the past five years (Q106 and Q107). Those who have not travelled abroad during this period will be diverted away from all questions concerning the police in other countries. Second, they will be asked a set of questions assessing the strength of their connection with the country (Q108-Q110).

Third, to assess respondents' views of the procedural fairness of the police in the country they have visited most often, they will be told to "imagine you are driving through (country) on holiday, within the speed limit, with nothing wrong with your car, and with valid identification. A police officer stops you asks to see your identification. How likely do you think it is that the officer would:

- Be polite and respectful (Q111)
- Be satisfied with the identification and allow you to continue your journey (Q112)

- Be interested in listening to anything you have to say (Q113)

Fourth, a series of questions (Q114-Q121) will assess respondent's views of the legitimacy of the police, and the law, in this same country. These items replicate those asked in relation to police in the country in which the respondents actually live.

3.4 Policing of migrants and minorities (contact with police)

The 'core' survey will contain items on:

- Police-initiated contact (incidence and frequency) (Q21 and Q22)
- Perceived fairness of police during most recent police-initiated contact (Q24)
- Self-initiated contact (incidence and frequency) (Q28 ad Q29)
- Perceived fairness of police during most recent self-initiated contact (Q32)

The expanded version of the questionnaire will add items on:

- Overall satisfaction with most recent police- and/or self-initiated contact (Q23 and Q30)
- Measures of outcome satisfaction across both types of contact. (Q24, Q26, Q33)

3.5 Item-count technique

We also employ a new methodology – that some call the “item-count technique” – designed to measure sensitive behaviours and attitudes. An important task of the survey is to ask about past behaviour and future intentions to engage in such acts. These are inevitably sensitive questions. Item-count techniques are designed to elicit respondents' truthful answers, and thus to reduce the social desirability bias generated by respondents not reporting certain behaviours.

One way of protecting respondents' anonymity is the *item count method* or *list experiment* (Miller (1984); Raghavarao and Federer (1979) proposed a closely related approach), which has become increasingly popular recently (see Blair and Imai (2012) for a list of some applications). Its basic idea can be introduced with the question shown in Table 1, which was fielded in the Euro-Justis survey from a previous FP7-funded project.

Table 1. The item count question on buying stolen goods, as included in the Euro-Justis survey

'I am now going to read you a list of five [six] things that people may do or that may happen to them. Please listen to them and then tell me how many of them you have done or have happened to you in the last 12 months. Do not tell me which ones are and are not true for you. Just tell me how many you have done at least once.'

[Items included in both the control and treatment groups]

1. Attended a religious service, except for a special occasion like a wedding or funeral.
2. Went to a sporting event.
3. Attended an opera.
4. Visited a country outside [your country]?
5. Had personal belongings such as money or a mobile phone stolen from you or from your house.

[Item included in the treatment group only]

6. Bought something you thought might have been stolen.
-

Each respondent is presented with some or all of a list of questions with possible answers of yes or no. One of these is the *sensitive item* which is the focus of interest; in our case this is item 6, which asks whether the respondent has bought stolen goods in the past 12 months. All the other questions are *control items* that are not of direct interest and not meant to be sensitive. The survey respondents are randomly assigned to either the *control group*, whose list includes only the control items, or the *treatment group*, who receive both the control items and the sensitive item. In both groups a respondent is asked to report only their total number of yes answers but not the replies to the individual items.

Table 2 shows the observed frequencies of these total counts in a sample in our application. The intention of the item count method is that respondents in the treatment group should feel able to include a truthful answer to the sensitive item in their response because they would realize that it would be hidden from the interviewer when only the total count is reported. Compared with the classical randomized response method, this has the advantage of avoiding the potentially distracting act of randomization by the respondents themselves during the interview. Potential disadvantages of the item count method are that only the treatment group provides information about the question of interest, and that the inclusion of the control items complicates the survey design and add uncertainty to the estimation.

Q126A and Q126B in the draft questionnaire show the item count survey questions.

Table 2. Numbers of respondents with different reported totals for the item count question in the Euro-Justis survey

<i>Group</i>	<i>Item count</i>							<i>Total</i>
	<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>6</i>	
Control	269	472	257	133	54	21	—	1206
Treatment	279	446	281	124	53	20	9	1212

4. KEY HYPOTHESES

The survey described here was designed specifically to address a set of key hypotheses. Designing the survey instrument as a hypothesis-testing tool enhances the robustness of findings generated from it, although, with a cross-sectional, snap shot survey we are far from being able to assert causal relationships. These key hypotheses can be grouped into three sections, congruent with the three areas of emphasis described above: Compliance with ‘new’ laws and regulations; cybercrime; and procedural justice, legitimacy and compliance across national boundaries. Note that the hypotheses outlined below indicate merely the most important or central set of concerns, and the survey will be able to address a much wider set of research questions.

4.1 Compliance with ‘new’ laws and regulations

As described above, three new laws and regulations are covered in the survey: downloading music, TV shows or films from internet sites that may be illegal; buying alcohol, cigarettes or other goods that have been bought into the country without paying tax; employing somebody who does not have the right to work in the country.

The first set of hypotheses here replicate the standard procedural justice literature. In each case we expect that:

- Experiences of perceptions of police procedural justice will be negatively associated with compliance.
- Part or all of the association between procedural justice and compliance will be mediated by legitimacy.
- The procedural justice/legitimacy pathway will be a stronger predictor of compliance than instrumental concerns about the risk of sanction.

The second set of hypotheses related to the possibly novel moral context of these ‘new’ laws (note that many of these hypotheses will only be addressed if and when the expanded version of the survey is fielded):

- People who believe these new laws proscribe activities that are harmful will be more likely to abide by them.

- People who believe social disapproval is stronger in relation to a specific act will be more likely to comply with laws that proscribe it.
- Legitimacy is a stronger predictor of compliance with 'new' laws when perceptions of their harmfulness, and social disapproval, is higher.
- A sense that police are legitimate motivates a sense that the 'new' laws they enforce cover activities that are morally wrong.

4.2 Cybercrime

Hypotheses in relation to this section of the survey include:

- People with higher confidence in using internet for payment-related activities are more likely to comply with the laws concerning cybercrimes, even if they think some cybercrimes are not "morally" wrong.
- Particularly regarding cybercrimes, people assess as a crime only activities that are considered as morally wrong in a given society and not the activities proscribed by the existing laws.
- The mass-nature of specific cybercrimes (e.g. download and use of illegal software and other content) is not due to the lack of knowledge that the given activity is a crime but due to the attitudes towards these activities as "socially acceptable".
- Perceptions towards cybercrimes as criminal activities are related to the fact whether the victim of the crime could be directly identified and thus, the crime will be harmful for him/her or there is not a direct victim and nobody will sustain a direct loss.

4.3 Procedural justice, legitimacy and compliance across national boundaries

Hypotheses in relation to this section of the survey include:

- When people imagine their relationships with police in a foreign country, the extent to which they think police are procedurally fair will predict the extent to which they hold police legitimate.
- The association between procedural justice and legitimacy will, in the case of 'foreign' police, be mediated by connection to the country concerned – the stronger the connection, the stronger the association between fairness and legitimacy.

4.4 Policing of migrants and minorities

Hypotheses in relation to the policing of migrants and minorities are laid out below. Recall that the sample size of minority and/or immigrant groups is likely to be small in most if not all of the FIDUCIA survey countries – this will affect the ability of analysis to address these hypotheses, although it is hard to be certain of this issue before the data are collected.

- People from ethnic minority groups are more likely to have experienced police-initiated contact than their majority group counterparts.
- Migrants to a country are more likely to have experienced police-initiated contact than their counterparts born in that country.
- Ethnic minority and migrant respondents will be less satisfied with contact with police.
- Ethnicity and immigration status will be associated with trust in, and views on the legitimacy of, police. However it is not clear that this will necessarily be a negative association – work in the UK, for example, tends to find that while some minority groups have lower levels of trust in the police than the White majority, some have more trust (e.g. Bradford et al. 2009), pointing to a complex relationship between ethnicity, immigration history and relationships with the criminal justice system.

4.5 Item-count technique

One part of the survey is to examine the item count technique. This method can be useful in eliciting sensitive information from survey respondents. Prior work has shown the importance of the choice of non-sensitive items (Kuha & Jackson, 2014). To our knowledge, no work has examined the item-count technique in a multi-national comparative context. The current survey includes an experiment that allows us to compare two sets of the control items, with a stronger and a weaker thematic connection to the sensitive item. This dimension is known to affect the performance of the method, but optimal choices are not well understood. In the analysis, we will then compare the answers with respect to nonresponse, measurement error in the direct question, and effects on regression models for the illegal behaviour.

5. SUMMARY AND NEXT STEPS

This deliverable has outlined the context, conceptual underpinning and content of a survey to be fielded in seven countries, each of which has representatives in the FIDUCIA consortium: UK, Germany, Italy, Finland, Bulgaria, Lithuania and Turkey. Building on earlier work from project partners on the ESS, the surveys will break new ground in consideration of compliance with new rules and regulations and the portability of procedural justice across national boundaries. The surveys will also add to knowledge on public experiences and perceptions of cybercrime, the policing of migrants and minority groups, and novel techniques for measuring offending behaviour in survey contexts.

Following the model of the ESS, the surveys will be managed at a national level, with FIDUCIA partners and local survey companies feeding in to matters such as translation and ensuring the applicability of ideas and concepts across all seven countries.

APPENDIX A:

**FP7 RESEARCH PROJECT
FOR NEW EUROPEAN CRIMES
AND TRUST-BASED POLICY**



FIDUCIA

NEW EUROPEAN CRIMES AND TRUST-BASED POLICY



**SP1 - COOPERATION
SSH.2011.3.2-1
GRANT AGREEMENT NR 290653**

Work Package 12:	Trust and attitudes to justice “abroad”
Task 12.1:	Design of the survey indicators
Deliverable 12.1:	Survey items / Questionnaire (in English)

Version:	Date:	30/09/2014
Type:	Deliverable	
Confidentiality:	Public	
Responsible Partner:	LSE	
Editor:	Jon Jackson (LSE)	
Contributors:	Mike Hough (BBK), Ben Bradford (OXFORD), Stefano Maffei (UNIPR), Todor Galev, Maria Yordanova (CSD), Evaldas Visockas (TEISE)	

Preliminary note:

This questionnaire comes in a **standard** form (items highlighted in yellow only) and an **extended** form (the entire document including the highlighted portions).

Partners are invited to search the best value option that allows them to flexible in the fielding of this survey as specified in the “tender” document.

I would now like to ask you some questions about how morally wrong you consider certain ways of behaving to be.

Please tell me how wrong¹ it is to...**READ OUT...**

		Not wrong at all	Slightly wrong	Wrong	Seriously wrong	N/A	(Don't know)
1	...download music, TV shows or films from internet sites that may be illegal?	1	2	3	4	7	8
2	...steal a DVD or other media format containing music, TV shows or films from a shop?	1	2	3	4	7	8
3	...buy something you ² thought might be stolen?	1	2	3	4	7	8
4	...buy alcohol, cigarettes or other goods that have been brought into [country] without taxes being paid?	1	2	3	4	7	8
5	...employ somebody who does not have the right to work in [country], for example as a plumber or nanny.	1	2	3	4	7	8

¹ 'Wrong' in the sense of 'morally wrong'.

² 'You' as in 'the respondent personally'.

To what extent do you think each of these acts cause harm to the victim, community and society?

		No harm at all	A little harm	A moderate amount of harm	A lot of harm	N/A	(Don't know)
6	... download music, TV shows or films from internet sites that may be illegal?	1	2	3	4	7	8
7	...steal a DVD or other media format containing music, TV shows or films from a shop?	1	2	3	4	7	8
8	...buy something you thought might be stolen?	1	2	3	4	7	8
9	...buy alcohol, cigarettes or other goods that have been brought into [country] without taxes being paid?	1	2	3	4	7	8
10	...employ somebody who does not have the right to work in [country], for example as a plumber or nanny.	1	2	3	4	7	8

If your friends knew that you did each of these things, how likely is it that they would disapprove or think you had done something wrong?

		Not at all Likely	Not very likely	Quite likely	Very likely	N/A	(Don't know)
11	... download music, TV shows or films from internet sites that may be illegal?	1	2	3	4	7	8
12	...steal a DVD or other media format containing music, TV shows or films from a shop?	1	2	3	4	7	8
13	...buy something you thought might be stolen?	1	2	3	4	7	8
14	...buy alcohol, cigarettes or other goods that have been brought into [country] without taxes being paid?	1	2	3	4	7	8
15	...employ somebody who does not have the right to work in [country], for example as a plumber or nanny.	1	2	3	4	7	8

Now just suppose you were to do any of these things in [country]. Using this card, please tell me how likely it is that you would be discovered and punished³ if you...

		Not at all Likely	Not very likely	Likely	Very likely	N/A	(Don't know)
16	... download music, TV shows or films from internet sites that may be illegal?	1	2	3	4	7	8
17	...steal a DVD or other media format containing music, TV shows or films from a shop?	1	2	3	4	7	8
18	...buy something you thought might be stolen?	1	2	3	4	7	8
19	...buy alcohol, cigarettes or other goods that have been brought into [country] without taxes being paid?	1	2	3	4	7	8
20	...employ somebody who does not have the right to work in [country], for example as a plumber or nanny.	1	2	3	4	7	8

³ 'Punished' as in 'punished by the law'; this could be in the form of a prison sentence, fine or any other sentence.

21 Now some questions about the police⁴ in [country]. In the past 2 years, have the police in your community approached⁵ you⁶, or made contact with you for any reason?

Yes	1	
No	2	[go to 28]
(DK)	8	[go to 28]

22 How many times?

Once	1
Two or three times	2
Four or five times	3
Six or more times	4
(DK)	8

23 How satisfied or dissatisfied were you with your experience with the police the last time this happened?

Very dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied	Satisfied	Very satisfied
1	2	3	4	5

24 Thinking about your experience with the police the last time this happened [if more than one encounter from question 22], how fairly were you treated by the police?

Very unfairly	Unfairly	Neither unfairly nor fairly	Fairly	Very fairly
1	2	3	4	5

⁴ Note that a generic term should be used here and consistently throughout the survey. The translation should encompass all of the different types / levels of police in [country]. If any country specific examples are required to demonstrate that all the police are to be included (e.g. City guards in Poland) these should be mentioned once here and the respondents should then be informed that 'from now on we will simply say the police in [country]'. Countries should reflect on the questions in the module and consider whether any officials who share a range of powers with the police should be mentioned. Note that groups who only control parking should not generally be included.

⁵ Approach for any reason (e.g. to ask you for information or because they suspect you have committed a crime or they need to ask you to do something).

⁶ 'You' as in 'the police approached, stooped or contacted the respondent personally'.

25 To what extent would you say that you got the outcome you wanted?

Nothing that you wanted	A little bit of what you wanted	Some of what you wanted	Most of what you wanted	Everything you wanted	N/A	(Don't know)
1	2	3	4	5	8	9

26 To what extent did you receive the right outcome according to your understanding of the law?

Not at all	A little bit	Somewhat	Mostly	Completely	N/A	(Don't know)
1	2	3	4	5	8	9

[IF MORE THAN ONE EXPERIENCE FROM Q22]

27 Thinking about all the times in which the police in your community have approached you, stopped you or made contact with you for any reason in the past two years, overall how satisfied or dissatisfied have you been with your experiences with the police?

Very dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied	Satisfied	Very satisfied
1	2	3	4	5

28 In the past 2 years, have you approached the local police to ask for help or assistance of any kind?

Yes	1	
No	2	[go to 35]
(Don't Know)	8	[go to 35]

29 How many times?

Once	1
Two or three times	2
Four or five times	3
Six or more times	4
(Don't Know)	8

30 How satisfied or dissatisfied were you with your experience with the police the last time this happened?

Very dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied	Satisfied	Very satisfied
1	2	3	4	5

31 Thinking about your experience with the police the last time this happened [if more than one encounter from question 28], how fairly did the police make decisions about what to do?

Very unfairly	Unfairly	Neither unfairly nor fairly	Fairly	Very fairly
1	2	3	4	5

32 How fairly were you treated by the police?

Very unfairly	Unfairly	Neither unfairly nor fairly	Fairly	Very fairly
1	2	3	4	5

33 To what extent would you say that you got the outcome you wanted?

Nothing that you wanted	A little bit of what you wanted	Some of what you wanted	Most of what you wanted	Everything you wanted	N/A	(Don't know)
1	2	3	4	5	8	9

[IF MORE THAN ONE EXPERIENCE FROM 29]

34 Thinking about all the times in which you have approached the police in your community to ask for help or assistance of any kind in the past two years, how satisfied or dissatisfied have you been with your experiences with the police?

Very dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied	Satisfied	Very satisfied
1	2	3	4	5

35 Based on what you have heard or your own experience, how successful do you think the police⁷ are at preventing crimes in [country] where violence is used or threatened? Choose your answer from this card, where 0 is extremely unsuccessful and 10 is extremely successful.

Extremely	Extremely	(Don't
Unsuccessful	successful	know)

00	01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10	88
----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----

36 And how successful do you think the police are at catching people who commit house burglaries⁸ in [country]? Use the same card.

Extremely	Extremely	(Don't
unsuccessful	successful	know)

00	01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10	88
----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----

37 If a violent crime⁹ were to occur near where you live and the police were called¹⁰, how slowly or quickly do you think they would arrive at the scene? Choose your answer from this card, where 0 is extremely slowly and 10 is extremely quickly.

Extremely	Extremely	(Don't
slow	quick	know)

00	01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10	88
----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----

(Violent crimes never occur near to where I live) 55

⁷ Again the generic name for all police in [country] should be used. The question itself and those that follow provide specific cues to respondents that might limit the frame of reference to a specific group / type of police in some countries. However this should be achieved by the crime referred to and NOT by amending the name of the specific police referenced.

⁸ House burglary is when someone breaks into a property or enters uninvited with the intention of stealing.

⁹ 'Violent crime' meaning crimes where violence is used or threatened.

¹⁰ Called in the sense of telephoned.

Now some questions about when the police¹¹ deal with people who have experienced crimes like house burglary and physical assault.

38 Based on what you have heard or your own experience, how often would you say the police generally treat people in [country] with respect ...

...not at all often,	1
not very often,	2
often,	3
or, very often?	4
(Don't know)	8

39 About¹² how often would you say that the police make fair and impartial¹³ decisions in the cases they deal with? Would you say...

...not at all often,	1
not very often,	2
often,	3
or, very often?	4
(Don't know)	8

40 And when dealing with people in [country], how often would you say the police generally explain their decisions and actions when asked to do so? Would you say...

...not at all often,	1
not very often,	2
often,	3
or, very often?	4
(No one ever asks the police to explain their decisions and actions)	5
(Don't know)	8

¹¹ Note we do not suppose there is a police force that only deals with burglary and physical assault in a particular country. A general reference to the police should be used throughout the survey.

¹² About in the sense of approximately or roughly.

¹³ 'Fair, impartial' - in British English the use of both of these words clarifies the meaning of 'fair' in the context of this question. Countries should ensure that impartiality is conveyed.

Now some questions about whether or not the police in [country] treat¹⁴ victims of crime equally. Please answer based on what you have heard or your own experience.

41 When victims report¹⁵ crimes, do you think the police treat rich people worse, poor people worse, or are rich and poor treated equally?

<i>Rich people treated worse</i>	1
<i>Poor people treated worse</i>	2
<i>Rich and poor treated equally</i>	3
<i>(Don't know)</i>	8

42 And when victims report crimes, do you think the police treat some people worse because of their race or ethnic group, or is everyone treated equally?

People from a different race or ethnic group than most [country] people treated worse	1
People from the same race or ethnic group as most [country] people treated worse	2
Everyone treated equally regardless of their race or ethnic group	3
1.1.2.	8
<i>(Don't know)</i>	

¹⁴ Treat in the sense of how the police respond to and deal with people.

¹⁵ Report in the sense of 'report in person' so that the police can see them.

Now some questions about your duty towards the police in [country], where duty means you have a moral duty to obey the police. Use this card where 0 is not at all your duty and 10 is completely your duty.

To what extent is it your moral duty to...

Not at all
my duty

Completely
my duty (Don't
know)

43	... back the decisions made by the police because the police are legitimate authorities?	00	01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10	88
44	...back ¹⁶ the decisions made by the police even when you disagree with them?	00	01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10	88
45	...do what the police tell you even if you don't understand or agree with the reasons?	00	01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10	88
46	... do what the police tell you to do, even if you don't like how they treat you?	00	01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10	88

¹⁶ Back in the sense of 'support'.

Please say to what extent you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about the police in [country].

		Disagree strongly	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Agree strongly	(Don't know)
47	The police usually act in ways that are consistent with my own ideas of right and wrong.	1	2	3	4	5	8
48	The police can be trusted to make the right decisions	1	2	3	4	5	8
49	The police generally have the same sense of right and wrong ¹⁷ as I do.	1	2	3	4	5	8
50	The police stand up for ¹⁸ values that are important to people like me.	1	2	3	4	5	8
51	Most of the time when the police arrest a person there is a good reason to believe that the person has done something wrong	1	2	3	4	5	8

¹⁷ 'Sense of right and wrong' in terms of 'feeling of morally right or wrong from a personal point of view'.

¹⁸ 'Stand up for' in the sense of 'defend/uphold/promote'.

How often (if ever) do you think the police ...

		Never	Rarely	Occasionally	Often	All the time	(Don't know)
52	...exceed their authority	1 Agree strongly	2 Agree	3 Neither agree nor disagree	4 Disagree	5 Disagree strongly	8 Don't know)
53	... abuse their power	1	2	3	4	5	8
54	...act as if they are above the law	1	2	3	4	5	8

Now some questions about your duty towards the law in [country], where duty means you have a moral duty to obey the law.

		Disagree strongly	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Agree strongly	(Don't know)
55	All laws should ¹⁹ be strictly obeyed.	1	2	3	4	5	8
56	Doing the right thing always means obeying the law.	1	2	3	4	5	8
57	Even if you disagree with a law, you should always obey it	1	2	3	4	5	8
58	Even if you do not understand why something is illegal, you should never break the law	1	2	3	4	5	8
59	The law represents the values and interests of the people in power, rather than the values and interests of people like yourself.	1	2	3	4	5	8
60	People in power use the law to try to control people like you.	1	2	3	4	5	8
61	Obeying the law ultimately benefits everyone in society	1	2	3	4	5	8
62	It is important that everybody obeys the law, no matter what position they have in society	1	2	3	4	5	8

¹⁹ 'Should' - in the sense of 'must'.

A law may be disobeyed ...

		No	Yes
63	...when this is the only alternative left for achieving important objectives.	1	2
64	...when this is the only way one has to help one's family.	1	2
65	...when others who disobeyed it were not punished.	1	2
66	...when others do it.	1	2
67	...when one distrusts the body that passed the law.	1	2
68	...when one is sure nobody will realize.	1	2
69	...when nobody gets hurt.	1	2
70	...when one is not familiar with the law.	1	2
71	...when one distrusts the authority executing the law.	1	2
72	...when one can obtain economic benefits.	1	2

How important is each of the following to how you see yourself:

		Not at all important	A little bit important	Fairly important	Very important	(Don't know)
73	Being [insert nationality]	1	2	3	4	5
74	Being a law abiding citizen	1	2	3	4	5

Now, how important is each to of the following to how you would like others to see you:

		Not at all important	A little bit important	Fairly important	Very important	(Don't know)
75	Being [insert nationality]	1	2	3	4	5
76	Being a law abiding citizen	1	2	3	4	5

How important are the following behaviours for being a good citizen?

		Not at all important	A little bit important	Fairly important	Very important	(Don't know)
77	Voting in every national election	1	2	3	4	8
78	Joining a political party	1	2	3	4	8
79	Learning about the country's history	1	2	3	4	8
80	Following political issues in the newspaper, on the radio, on TV or on the internet	1	2	3	4	8
81	Showing respect for government representatives	1	2	3	4	8
82	Engaging in political discussions	1	2	3	4	8
83	Obeying the law	1	2	3	4	8
84	Obeying the police	1	2	3	4	8
85	Supporting legal authorities, for example by reporting crimes to the police	1	2	3	4	8
86	Participating in peaceful protests against laws believed to be unjust	1	2	3	4	8
87	Participating in activities to benefit people in the local community	1	2	3	4	8

88	Taking part in activities promoting human rights	1	2	3	4	8
89	Taking part in activities to protect the environment	1	2	3	4	8

Based upon what you have seen and heard about the police, do you disagree or agree that:

		Agree strongly	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Disagree strongly	(Don't know)
90	...the police are generally suspicious of people like you.	1	2	3	4	5	8
91	...the police treat people like you as if you are probably doing something wrong.	1	2	3	4	5	8
92	...the police treat people like you as if you might be dangerous or violent.	1	2	3	4	5	8

Now some questions about what you would do if you were the only witness to a crime. The next few questions do not have a showcard.

1.1.3.

1.1.4. 93 Imagine that you were out²⁰ and saw someone push a man to the ground and steal his wallet. How likely would you be to call²¹ the police? Would you be...READ OUT...

...not at all likely,	1
not very likely,	2
likely,	3
or, very likely?	4
(Don't know)	8

94 How willing²² would you be to identify the person who had done it? Would you be...READ OUT...

...not at all willing,	1
not very willing,	2

²⁰ 'Out' as in 'not at one's home'.

²¹ 'Call' refers to telephoning the police.

²² 'Willing' in the sense of 'freely choose to'.

willing,	3
or, very willing?	4
(Don't know)	8

95 If you were to call the police and identify the person, how likely do you think it is that the police would catch the person? Would you it be...**READ OUT...**

...not at all likely,	1
not very likely,	2
likely,	3
or, very likely?	4
(Don't know)	8

96 And how willing would you be to give evidence²³ in court against the accused? Would you be...**READ OUT...**

...not at all willing,	1
not very willing,	2
willing,	3
or, very willing?	4
(Don't know)	8

97 If you were to give evidence in court against the accused, how likely do you think it is that the person would be found guilty? Would you it be...**READ OUT...**

...not at all likely,	1
not very likely,	2
likely,	3
or, very likely?	4
(Don't know)	8

Now some questions about things you might have done.

Using this card please tell me how often you have done each of these things in the last five years? How often have you...**READ OUT...**

		Never	Once	Twice	3 or 4 times	5 times or more	(Don't know)
98	...downloaded music, TV shows, films and other files from illegal internet sites?	1	2	3	4	5	8
99	...stolen a DVD or other media format containing music, TV shows or films from a shop?	1	2	3	4	5	8

²³ 'Evidence' refers to the 'testimony' a witness gives verbally in court.

100	...bought something you ²⁴ thought might be stolen?	1	2	3	4	5	8
101	...bought alcohol, cigarettes or other goods that have been brought into [country] without taxes being paid?	1	2	3	4	5	8
102	...employ somebody who does not have the right to work in [country], for example as a plumber or nanny.	1	2	3	4	7	8

Now some questions about things you might do in the future. If the opportunity arose, how likely is it that you would ...**READ OUT...**

		Not at all likely	Not very likely	Fairly likely	Very likely	(Don't know)
103	...buy something you ²⁵ thought might be stolen?	1	2	3	4	8
104	...buy alcohol, cigarettes or other goods that have been brought into [country] without taxes being paid?	1	2	3	4	8
105	...employ somebody who does not have the right to work in [country], if for example you were looking to employ someone as a plumber or a nanny.	1	2	3	4	8

106 In the past five years, have you visited another European country, whether for work, holiday or other reasons?

Yes	1	
No	2	[go to 122]
(n/a)	8	[go to 122]
(DK)	9	[go to 122]

²⁴ 'You' as in 'the respondent personally'.

²⁵ 'You' as in 'the respondent personally'.

107 Which country (and if it is more than one, which country have you visited the most)?

[code verbatim]

108 How well do you know [insert country]?

Not at all well	Not very well	Quite well	Very well
1	2	3	4

109 To what extent do you like the people from [insert country]?

Not at all	A little bit	Quite a lot	Extremely
1	2	3	4

110 To what extent do you like the way of life in [insert country]?

Not at all	A little bit	Quite a lot	Extremely
1	2	3	4

Now, imagine you are driving through [insert country] on holiday, within the speed limit, with nothing wrong with your car, and with valid identification. A police officer stops you and asks to see your identification. How likely do you think it is that the officer would...

		Not at all likely	Not very likely	Fairly likely	Very likely	(Don't know)
111	...be polite and respectful?	1	2	3	4	8
112	...be satisfied with the identification and allow you to continue your journey?	1	2	3	4	8
113	...be interested in listening to anything that you have to say?	1	2	3	4	8

Now, thinking about the time that you spend in [country]. Please say to what extent you agree or disagree with each of the following statements.

		Agree strongly	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Disagree strongly	(Don't know)
114	I feel a duty to obey all laws [in country].	1	2	3	4	5	8
115	Even if you disagree with a law [in country], you should always obey it	1	2	3	4	5	8
116	The police in [country] usually act in ways that are consistent with my own ideas of right and wrong.	1	2	3	4	5	8
117	The police in [country] can be trusted to make the right decisions	1	2	3	4	5	8
118	The police [in country] abuse their power	1	2	3	4	5	8
119	The police [in country] think they are above the law	1	2	3	4	5	8

To what extent is it your moral duty to...**Not at all
my duty****Completel
y my duty (Don't
know)**

		00	01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10	88
120	...do what the police in [country] tell you even if you don't understand or agree with the reasons?												
121	... do what the police in [country] tell you to do, even if you don't like how they treat you?												

Some people think it is right to use violence to achieve different aims, while others think the use of violence is always wrong. How acceptable is each of the following:

		Not at all acceptable	Not very acceptable	Moderately acceptable	Very acceptable	(Don't know)
122	A police officer uses deadly force against a person who is armed and believed to pose a threat to other people's lives	1	2	3	4	8
123	A police officer strikes a citizen who attacks the policeman with his fists	1	2	3	4	8
124	A police officer uses physical force against an offender who is handcuffed and in police custody	1	2	3	4	8
125	A police officer uses force to effect an arrest of an unarmed person who is not offering violent resistance	1	2	3	4	8

125 a-

CYBERCRIME Section of FIDUCIA survey**125a.****In the last 12 months how often have you did the following activities online?***One answer is required at each row*

		Every day	Once a week	Once a month	Only occasionally	Never	Don't know
1	Online banking	1	2	3	4	5	9
2	Buying goods or services (incl. software, holidays, books, music, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5	9
3	Using online social networks (e.g. Facebook, Twitter)	1	2	3	4	5	9
4	Email	1	2	3	4	5	9
5	Reading news online	1	2	3	4	5	9
6	Playing games online	1	2	3	4	5	9
7	Watching TV via internet	1	2	3	4	5	9
8	Download music, TV shows, films or other files, intended for entertainment	1	2	3	4	5	9
9	Download software for your computer / laptop	1	2	3	4	5	9
10	Use online administrative services, offered by local or national government authorities	1	2	3	4	5	9

125b.

How confident are you about the security of using Internet for the following activities that require payments or money transfers online?

One answer is required at each row

		Very confident	Fairly confident	Not very confident	Not at all confident
1	Online banking	1	2	3	4
2	Buying goods or services	1	2	3	4
3	Use online administrative services, requiring payments, offered by local or national government authorities	1	2	3	4

125c. Has concern over security issues made you change the way you use the Internet in any of the following ways?

Tick all the options that apply to you

- 1 I am less likely to buy goods or services online
- 2 I am less likely to bank online
- 3 I am less likely to give personal information on websites
- 4 I am changing security settings (e.g. your browser, online social media, search engine, etc.)
- 5 I only visit websites I know and trust
- 6 I do not open emails from people I don't know
- 7 I only use my own computer for activities that require sharing of personal information or online payments
- 8 I have used specialized software or tools to improve my security online (e.g. encryption software, virtual private networks, etc.)
- 9 I have cancelled an online purchase because of suspicions about the seller or the website

125d. Thinking about online harassment, have you or has any of your children ever been a victim of any kind of online harassment (this can include anything from cyber bullying or blackmailing to more serious Internet dangers)?

Tick all the options that apply to you

- 1 Yes, me personally
- 2 Yes, my children
- 3 No
- 4 I do not use the Internet
- 5 My children do not use Internet
- 6 Refusal (I do not want to answer)

125e. “Cybercrime” include many different types of criminal activity. How often have you experienced or been a victim of the following?

One answer is required at each row

		Often	Occasionally	Never	Don't know
1	Identity theft (somebody stealing your personal data and impersonating you, e.g. shopping under your name)	1	2	3	9
2	Received emails or any kind of online instant messages fraudulently asking for access to your computer, logins, or personal details (including banking or payment information)	1	2	3	9
3	Accidentally encountering web-sites that are masqueraded as a trustworthy web-site in order to steal your personal details (including banking or payment information)	1	2	3	9
4	Online fraud where goods purchased were not delivered, counterfeit or not as advertised	1	2	3	9
5	Accidentally encountering material which promotes racial hatred or religious extremism	1	2	3	9
6	Not being able to access online services (e.g. banking services) because of cyber attacks	1	2	3	9
7	Your social media or email account being hacked	1	2	3	9
8	Being a victim of credit card or banking fraud online	1	2	3	9
9	Accidentally encountering child pornography	1	2	3	9

125f. And how concerned are you personally about experiencing or being a victim of the following “cybercrimes”?

One answer is required at each row

		Very concerned	Fairly concerned	Not very concerned	Not at all concerned	Don't know
1	Identity theft (somebody stealing your personal data and impersonating you, e.g. shopping under your name)	1	2	3	4	9
2	Received emails or any kind of online instant messages fraudulently asking for access to your	1	2	3	4	9

	computer, logins, or personal details (including banking or payment information)					
3	Accidentally encountering web-sites that are masqueraded as a trustworthy web-site in order to steal your personal details (including banking or payment information)	1	2	3	4	9
4	Online fraud where goods purchased were not delivered, counterfeit or not as advertised	1	2	3	4	9
5	Accidentally encountering material which promotes racial hatred or religious extremism	1	2	3	4	9
6	Being unable to access online services (e.g. banking services) because of cyber attacks	1	2	3	4	9
7	Hacking of your social media or email account	1	2	3	4	9
8	Being a victim of credit card or banking fraud online	1	2	3	4	9
9	Accidentally encountering child pornography	1	2	3	4	9

125g. Please, tell us how wrong it is in your opinion to:

One answer is required at each row

		Not wrong at all	A bit wrong	Wrong	Seriously wrong	(Don't know)
1	Download for free music, TV shows, or films, for which you know they are illegal copies	1	2	3	4	9
2	Download for free any kind of software, for which you know it is illegal copy	1	2	3	4	9

3	Share or publish material which promotes racial hatred or religious extremism	1	2	3	4	9
4	Share or publish material which include child pornography	1	2	3	4	9
5	To gain unauthorised access to or sabotage someone's system or computer (e.g. hacking, distribution of viruses, etc.)	1	2	3	4	9

125h. Has anyone ever broken into any of your online accounts including email, social network, banking, and online gaming ones?

Tick only one option

- 1 No
- 2 Yes, once
- 3 Yes, more than once
- 4 I do not use Internet

125i. How much money have you lost in the last three years due to any kind of computer criminal activity?

Tick only one option

- 1 Up to EUR 50 (or equivalent national currency)
- 2 EUR 51 - 300
- 3 EUR 300 - 1 000
- 4 Over EUR 1 000
- 5 In the last three years I have never lost money due to a computer criminal activity

Now, I would like to ask you some details about yourself and others in your household.

[NOTE TO SURVEY COMPANY] The next question has a 2x2 experimental design. First, the sample is split into two randomly selected groups: (1) gets 126a; (2) gets 126b. Second, each of the two randomly selected groups is split into two further groups. Half get only the first five items. The other half get all six items (see below).

126a I am now going to read you a list of five [six] things that people may do. Please listen to them and then tell me how many of them you have done in the last 12 months. Do not tell me which ones you have or have not done. Just tell me how many you have done at least once.

[SPLIT BALLOT: RANDOM HALF GETS ONLY THE FIRST FIVE ITEMS, OTHER RANDOM HALF GETS ALL THE SIX ITEMS]

1. Visited a country outside [your country].
2. Gone to a football match.
3. Attended the wedding of a friend or a relative.
4. Gone to the dentist for a check-up.
5. Bought a new car.
6. Downloaded music, TV shows or films from internet sites that may be illegal.

WRITE IN:

(Don't know)

8

126b I am now going to read you a list of five [six] things that people may do. Please listen to them and then tell me how many of them you have done in the last 12 months. Do not tell me which ones you have or have not done. Just tell me how many you have done at least once.

[SPLIT BALLOT: RANDOM HALF GETS ONLY THE FIRST FIVE ITEMS, OTHER RANDOM HALF GETS ALL THE SIX ITEMS]

1. Gone to a cinema to watch a film.
2. Gone to a music concert.
3. Bought a music CD in a shop.
4. Borrowed a book from a library.
5. Bought a book from the internet.
6. Downloaded music, TV shows or films from internet sites that may be illegal.

WRITE IN:

(Don't know)

8

127 Which phrase on this card best describes the area where you live?

- | | |
|--|---|
| A big city | 1 |
| The suburbs or outskirts of a big city | 2 |
| A town or a small city | 3 |
| A country village | 4 |
| A farm or home in the countryside | 5 |
| (Don't know) | 8 |

128 What year were you born?

WRITE IN:

129 Gender

Male

☐

Female

☐

130 About how many years of education have you completed, whether full-time or part-time? Please report these in full-time equivalents and include compulsory years of schooling.
INTERVIEWER NOTE: round answer up or down to the nearest whole year.

WRITE IN:
 (Don't know) 88

--	--

131 Using this card, which of these descriptions applies to what you have been doing for the last 7 days? Select all that apply. PROMPT Which others?

CODE ALL THAT APPLY

	in paid work (or away temporarily) (employee, self-employed, working for your family business)	01
	in education, (not paid for by employer) even if on vacation	02
	unemployed and actively looking for a job	
03	unemployed, wanting a job but not actively looking for a job	
04	permanently sick or disabled	
	05	
	retired	06
	in community or military service ²⁶	07
	doing housework, looking after children or other persons (other)	08
	(Don't know)	09
		88

132 Using this card, please tell me which letter describes your household's total income, after tax and compulsory deductions, from all sources? If you don't know the exact figure, please give an estimate. Use the part of the card that you know best: weekly, monthly or annual income²⁷.

J	01
R	02
C	03
M	04
F	05
S	06
K	07
P	08
D	09
H	10
(Refused)	77
(Don't know)	88

²⁶ This code does not apply to JOBS in the military but to compulsory military service only.

²⁷ The actual amounts must NOT appear on the questionnaire. Only the letters and the corresponding numeric codes.

NOTE ON FRAMING DECILE INCOME QUESTION, CATEGORIES AND CARD

An income showcard should be devised with approximate weekly, monthly and annual amounts. You should use ten income range categories, each corresponding broadly to DECILES OF THE ACTUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME RANGE in your country. These figures should be derived from the best available source for your country. The data source used should match the requirement of the question i.e. deciles of household income for all households (not for example average households or just households with children). Using the median income as the reference point, 10 deciles should be calculated with the median itself at the top of the fifth decile (Category F). The figures should not appear to be too exact. Minor rounding can be employed to achieve this if necessary.

Please note that a showcard must always be used at this question. The ten rows on the showcard should display the income ranges selected and be preceded by the ten letters used above (or their Cyrillic equivalent) which helps to ensure respondent confidentiality. Each country can choose whether to include weekly, monthly or annual amounts on the showcard or include more than one of these as appropriate. The text in the last sentence of F32 (above) should be rephrased to match the solution selected.

133 Which of the descriptions on this card comes closest to how you feel²⁸ about your household's income nowadays?

Living comfortably on present income	1
Coping on present income	2
Finding it difficult on present income	3
Finding it very difficult on present income	4
(Don't know)	8

134 In politics people sometimes talk of "left" and "right". Using this card, where would you place yourself on this scale, where 0 means the left and 10 means the right?

Left											Right (Don't Know)
00	01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10	88

²⁸ "Feel": 'describe', 'view' or 'see'.

135 [insert country specific question about ethnicity ... make sure the all the relevant categories are included. The UK question is below]

What is your ethnic group? Please choose one option on this card that best describes your ethnic group or background

White

1. English/Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish/British
2. Irish
3. Gypsy or Irish Traveller
4. Any other white background

Mixed/multiple ethnic groups

5. White and Black Caribbean
6. White and Black African
7. White and Asian
8. Any other Mixed / Multiple ethnic background

Asian / Asian British

9. Indian
10. Pakistani
11. Bangladeshi
12. Chinese
13. Any other Asian background

Black / African / Caribbean / Black British

14. African
15. Caribbean
16. Any other Black / African / Caribbean background

Other ethnic group

17. Arab
18. Any other ethnic group

136. Were you born in [Country]? ☐ Yes ☐ No. If answer is NO then go to 137

137. In which country were you born? [code verbatim].

REFERENCES

- Beetham, D. (1991). *The Legitimation of Power*. London: Macmillan.
- Bottoms, A., and Tankebe, J. (2012), 'Beyond Procedural Justice: A Dialogic Approach to Legitimacy in Criminal Justice', *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*.
- Bowling, B. and Philips, C. (2002). *Racism, crime and justice*. Harlow: Pearson Education.
- Bradford, B., Jackson, J., & Stanko, E. A. (2009). Contact and confidence: revisiting the impact of public encounters with the police. *Policing and Society*, 19(1), 20–46.
- Bradford, B., Jackson, J. and Hough, M. (2014a). 'Police Legitimacy in Action: Lessons for Theory and Practice', in Reisig, M. & Kane, R. (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Police and Policing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 551-570.
- Bradford, B., Murphy, K. and Jackson, J. (2014b). 'Officers as Mirrors: Policing, Procedural Justice and the (Re)production of Social Identity', *British Journal of Criminology*, 54, 4, 527-500.
- Cavadino, M. & Dignan, J. (2006) *Penal Systems. A Comparative Approach*. London / Thousand Oaks / New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Cavadino, M., & Dignan, J. (2013). Political economy and penal systems. *The Routledge Handbook of European Criminology*, edited by S. Body-Gendrot, M. Hough, R. Levy, K. Kerezsi, and S. Snacken. London: Routledge.
- European Social Survey (2011). 'Trust in Justice: Topline Findings from the European Social Survey', *ESS Topline Results Series Issue 1*. By Jackson, J., Hough, M., Bradford, B., Pooler, T. M., Hohl, K. and Kuha, J.

European Social Survey (2012). 'Policing by Consent: Understanding the Dynamics of Police Power and Legitimacy', *ESS Country Specific Topline Results Series Issue 1 (UK)*. By Jackson, J., Hough, M., Bradford, B., Hohl, K. and Kuha, J.

Fassin, D. (2013) *Enforcing Order*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Franko Aas, K and Bosworth, M. (2013). *The Borders of Punishment*. Oxford: OUP.

Hardin, R. (2002). *Trust and Trustworthiness*. New York: Russell Sage.

Hardin, R. (2006). *Trust*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Hawdon, J. (2008) 'Legitimacy, Trust, Social Capital, and Policing Styles: A Theoretical Statement', *Police Quarterly* 11: 182—201.

Hough, M. (2013) 'Procedural justice and professional policing in times of austerity', *Criminology and Criminal Justice* 13(2): 181–197.

Hough, M., Jackson, J. and Bradford, B. (2013a). 'The Governance of Criminal Justice, Legitimacy and Trust', in Body-Gendrot, S., Lévy, R., Hough, M. Snacken, S. and Kerecsi, K. (eds.) *The Routledge Handbook of European Criminology*. Oxon: Routledge, pp. 243-265.

Hough, M., Jackson, J. and Bradford, B. (2013b). 'Legitimacy, Trust and Compliance: An Empirical Test of Procedural Justice Theory Using the European Social Survey', in Tankebe, J. and Liebling, A. (eds.) *Legitimacy and Criminal Justice: An International Exploration*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 326-352.

- Hough, M., Bradford, B., Jackson, J. and Roberts, J. (2013c). *Attitudes to sentencing and trust in justice: Exploring trends from the Crime Survey of England and Wales*. London: Ministry of Justice.
- Imai, K. (2011) Multivariate regression analysis for the item count technique. *J. Am. Statist. Ass.*, 106, 407–416.
- Jackson, J. and Bradford, B. (2010). 'What is Trust and Confidence in the Police?', *Policing: A Journal of Policy and Practice*, 4, 3, 241-248.
- Jackson, J., Bradford, B., Hough, M., Kuha, J., Stares, S. R., Widdop, S., Fitzgerald, R., Yordanova, M. and Galev, T. (2011). 'Developing European Indicators of Trust in Justice', *European Journal of Criminology*, 8, 4, 267-285.
- Jackson, J., Bradford, B., Hough, M., Myhill, A., Quinton, P., and Tyler, T. R. (2012a). 'Why Do People Comply with the Law? Legitimacy and the Influence of Legal Institutions', *British Journal of Criminology*, 52, 6, 1051-1071.
- Jackson, J., Bradford, B., Stanko, E. A. and Hohl, K. (2012b). *Just Authority? Trust in the Police in England and Wales*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Jackson, J., Huq, A., Bradford, B. and Tyler, T. R. (2013). 'Monopolizing Force? Police Legitimacy and Public Attitudes towards the Acceptability of Violence', *Psychology, Public Policy and Law*, 19, 4, 479-497, doi: 10.1037/a0033852.
- Jackson, J., Asif, M., Bradford, B. and Zakar, M. Z. (forthcoming). 'Corruption and Police Legitimacy in Lahore, Pakistan', *British Journal of Criminology*.

- Jowell, R. and Eva, G. (2009). 'Happiness is Not Enough: Cognitive Judgements as Indicators of National Wellbeing', *Social Indicators Research*, 91, 3, 317-328.
- Kuha, J. and Jackson, J. (2014). 'The Item Count Method for Sensitive Survey Questions: Modelling Criminal Behaviour', *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series C (Applied Statistics)*, 63, 2, 321-342, .
- Lappi-Seppälä, T. (2011). Explaining imprisonment in Europe. *European Journal of Criminology*, 8(4), 303-328.
- Luhmann, N. (1979). *Trust and Power*. New York: Wiley.
- Miller, J. D. (1984) A new survey technique for studying deviant behavior. *PhD Thesis*. George Washington University, Washington DC.
- Mollering, G. (2006). *Trust: Reason, Routine and Reflexivity*. Bingley: Emerald Group.
- Raghavarao, D. and Federer, W. T. (1979) Block total response as an alternative to the randomized response method in surveys. *J. R. Statist. Soc. B*, 41, 40-45.
- Schulhofer, S., Tyler, T. R., & Huq, A. (2011). American policing at a crossroads: Unsustainable policies and the procedural justice alternative. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 101(2), 335-375.
- Stoutland, S. (2001) 'The multiple dimensions of trust in resident/police relations in Boston', *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 38(3): 226-256.
- Stumpf, J. (2006). The Crimmigration Crisis: Immigrants, Crime and Sovereign Power. *American University Law Review* 56(2): 367-419.

- Sunshine, J. and Tyler, T.R. (2003). The Role of Procedural Justice and Legitimacy in Shaping Public Support for Policing, *Law and Society Review*, 37: 513–48.
- Tankebe, J. (2013) 'Viewing things differently: the dimensions of public perceptions of legitimacy.' *Criminology*. Advance online access doi: 10.1111/j.1745-9125.2012.00291.x
- Tyler, T. R. (2006a), 'Psychological Perspectives on Legitimacy and Legitimation', *Annual Review of Psychology*, 57: 375—400.
- Tyler, T. R. (2006b), *Why People Obey the Law*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Tyler, T. R. (2011a), *Why People Cooperate: The Role of Social Motivations*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Tyler, T. R. (2011b), 'Trust and Legitimacy: Policing in the USA and Europe', *European Journal of Criminology* 8: 254—266.
- Tyler, T.R. and Huo, Y.J. (2002) *Trust in the law: Encouraging public cooperation with the police and courts*. New York: Russell-Sage Foundation.
- Tyler TR, Fagan J (2008) Legitimacy and cooperation: why do people help the police fight crime in their communities? *Ohio St J Crim Law* 6:231–27
- Tyler, T. R. and Jackson, J. (2013). 'Future Challenges in the Study of Legitimacy and Criminal Justice', in Tankebe, J. and Liebling, A. (eds.) *Legitimacy and Criminal Justice: An International Exploration*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 83-104.

Tyler, T. R. and Jackson, J. (2014). 'Popular Legitimacy and the Exercise of Legal Authority: Motivating Compliance, Cooperation and Engagement', *Psychology, Public Policy and Law*, 20, 1, 78-95, doi: 10.1037/a0034514.

Way, L.R. and Patten, R. (2013) *Hunting for Dirtbags: Why Cops Over-Police the Poor and Racial Minorities*. Boston: Northeastern University Press.

Weber, L. and Bowling, B. (2012). *Stop and Search: Police Power in Global Context*. London: Routledge.